

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 15, 2007, claims 1-9 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks. No claims have been added.

For reference, claim 1 is amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of claim 2, which is canceled. As a result, claims 3 and 4 are amended to depend directly from claim 1. Claim 1 is also amended to clarify the reference to an output signal having a substantially half rate relative to the rate of the data signal. This amendment is supported by the specification, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 31.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “a substantially half rate” of claim 1 is unclear. Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s observation and respectfully submit that claim 1 is amended to clarify the reference to an output signal having a substantially half rate relative to the rate of the data signal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van de Plassche (U.S. Pat. No. 5,510,736, hereinafter Plassche). Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanders (U.S. Pat. No. 4,373,141, hereinafter Sanders). Additionally, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of Abdi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,517,141, hereinafter Abdi). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Plassche, Sanders, and Abdi for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites “a linear amplifier (2) to receive a differential analog signal (D+, D-) under control by a first binary clock signal (H+) having a first phase, the linear amplifier (2) to provide a feed-forward input signal substantially equal with the differential analog signal (D+, D-) to a pseudo latch circuit (3) in the first phase of the first binary clock signal (H+)” (emphasis added).

In contrast, the combination of Sanders and Abdi does not teach or suggest a linear amplifier, as recited in the claim. As a preliminary matter, the Office Action recognizes that Sanders does not teach a linear amplifier, as recited in the claim. Abdi also fails to teach a linear amplifier, as recited in the claim, because neither of the transconductance amplifiers 212 and 214 is under control by a first binary clock signal and provides a feed-forward input signal to a pseudo latch circuit.

In particular, the transconductance amplifier 212 is not controlled by a clock signal. Although the Office Action asserts that the TRACK and TRACK-bar signals are clock signals, the TRACK signal and TRACK-bar signals are not shown or described as controlling the transconductance amplifier 212. Hence, Abdi does not teach or suggest a clock signal to control the transconductance amplifier 212.

In regard to the transconductance amplifier 214, the transconductance amplifier 214 does not provide a signal to the switch circuit 108 or the capacitor 110, which are together purported to be a latch. Thus, even if the switch circuit 108 and the capacitor 110 were to form a latch, the transconductance amplifier 214 does not provide a signal to the purported latch. Hence, Abdi does not teach or suggest the transconductance amplifier 214 as providing a signal to a latch.

Additionally, even if one of the transconductance amplifiers 212 and 214 were to both receive a clock signal and provide a signal to a latch circuit, there is no description in Abdi of the transconductance amplifiers 212 and 214 as having a linear response. Accordingly, Abdi fails to teach the transconductance amplifiers 212 and 214 and being linear amplifiers. It should also be noted that the Office Action’s reference to the subtractor 103 is inapposite and unrelated to the linear amplifier recited in the claim.

Therefore, neither of the transconductance amplifiers 212 and 214 anticipates the linear amplifier recited in the claim. Since Abdi does not teach a linear amplifier, as

recited in the claim, the combination of Sanders and Abdi does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Sanders and Abdi because the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim.

Dependent Claims 3-9

Claims 3-9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 3-9 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 3-9 may be allowable for further reasons. In particular, the Office Action does not reject claims 3-9 based on any of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-9 are patentable over Plassche, Sanders, and Abdi.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 15, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111